

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE 082/02133 3087 09/831,396 05/07/2001 **Edward Kantorovich** EXAMINER 44909 05/19/2005 ROBINSON, DANIEL LEON WOLF, BLOCK, SCHORR & SOLIS-COHEN LLP 250 PARK AVENUE PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT NEW YORK, NY 10177 3742

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

e
plicant(s)
NTOROVICH ET AL.
t Unit
42
spondence address
ROM
led
be considered timely. nailing date of this communication. 5 U.S.C. § 133). reduce any
eution as to the merits is 0.G. 213.
miner. CFR 1.85(a). ed to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). ion or form PTO-152.
or (f).

#### Application No. Ap 09/831,396 KΑ Office Action Summary Art Examiner Daniel I. Robinson 374

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corre Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely fil after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the maximum to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35)

Any earr	reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
Status	
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 February 2005</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposit	ion of Claims
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-30 and 50-58 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) 11-30 is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applicat	ion Papers
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119
(a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
2) Noti 3) Info	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)  ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  er No(s)/Mail Date 4/04,7/04,10/02,7/.  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date.  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  6) Other:

Application/Control Number: 09/831,396

Art Unit: 3742

## Response to Election

Applicant's election with traverse of Species A in the reply filed on 4-12-2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the terms "bone velocity" and "acoustic velocity in bone" are the same. This is not found persuasive because bone velocity taken literally means the velocity of a bone, and acoustic velocity in bone is the velocity of a sound vibration in a bone. If the terms are one and the same, then the claim language should be consistent.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There is no antecedent basis for "the jopint" in claim 11

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 09/831,396

Art Unit: 3742

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 14-21, and 50-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger(U.S.Pat.5,806,520) in view of Higo et al.(U.S.Pat.4,819,753). Berger discloses a method and device for evaluating and characterizing the properties of bones that shows many of the features of the claimed invention but fails to show first second bones as being analyzed with respect to the velocity of a sound wave through bone. Higo discloses a functional evaluation device that shows analyzing the acoustics of two bones. It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to use two bone measurements as taught by Higo with the device of Berger so the joint between two bones can be analyzed.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12-13 and 22-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Weinstein, Scanlon and Whitney are cited to show structure similar to the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/831,396

Art Unit: 3742

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel I. Robinson whose telephone number is 703 306-9043. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30am-2:30pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dlr